REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed June 5, 2006 and the Examiner's Answer dated November 16, 2007. Claims 1-11, 20-32, 34, 37, 39-46, 48-51, 53-60 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Final Office Action. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected 1-11, 20-32, 34, 37, 39-46, 48-51, 53-60. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

A.   Rejection of claims 1-6, 9-11, 20-32, 34, 37, 39-46, 48, 51 and 53-60 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Iyer, in view of Yamamoto and Yasue

Claim 1 is amended to further define "*a conversation state that operates to be invoked over an application service such as a Java Remote Method Invocation (RMI) or a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA).*"

The subject information in Iyer, which is interpreted by the Examiner as the conversation state in the office action and answer brief, actually refers to text, graphical images, sound files (Paragraph [**0003**]) and can not be invoked over an application service such as a Java Remote Method Invocation (RMI) or a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA), as known by person with ordinary skill in the arts.

In addition, Yamamoto teaches area chat rooms that allow users to carry portable terminals (Abstract), while Yasue teaches monitoring of harassment messages sent by a user (Abstract).

Therefore, Iyer in view of Yamamoto and Yasue cannot render independent claims 1, 10, 29, 30, 43, 44, 57 and 58 obvious. Since claims 5-6 and 9 depend on claim 1, claims 11, 20-28 depend on claim 10, claims 31, 32, 34, 37, 39-42 depend on claim 29, claims 45, 46, 48 and 51-56 depend on claim 43, claims 1-6, 9-11, 20-32, 34, 37, 39-46,

13

48 and 51-58 cannot be rendered obvious by Iyer in view of Yamamoto and Yasue under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

B.   Rejection of claims 7, 8, 35, 36, 49 and 50 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Iyer, Yamamoto, Yasue, further in view of Eide

Eide does not teach a conversation state that can be invoked over an application service such as a Java Remote Method Invocation (RMI) or a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) either.

Therefore, since claims 7 and 8 depend on claim 1, claims 35 and 36 depend on claim 29, and claims 49 and 50 depend on claim 43, Iyer in view of Yamamoto, Yasue, further in view of Eide cannot render the present invention in claims 7, 8, 17, 18, 35, 36, 49 and 50 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent. The Applicant respectably reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 11, 2008   By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                                 Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                                 Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910